DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 444 320 EC 308 011

TITLE	Program Expansion: Product Evaluation Report, 1998/99.
INSTITUTION	Saginaw Public Schools, MI. Dept. of Evaluation Services.
PUB DATE	1999-09-00
NOTE	24p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Disabilities; Elementary Education; Emotional Disturbances; Inservice Teacher Education; Learning Disabilities; Mild Mental Retardation; Postsecondary Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; *Special Education; Special Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS	*Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; Saginaw City School System MI

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates special education program expansion in the Saginaw (Michigan) school district with federal funding under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The program expansion involved: employment of 16 special education certified teachers to teach students with learning disabilities (LD), emotional impairments (EI), and educable mental impairment (EMI); provision of instructional services to elementary students with LD, EI, and EMI; and provision of inservice training to staff members. For each category, the evaluation report compares criteria in the grant to program data. The program served 221 students during 1998/99. The report concludes that: (1) the staffing objective was met; (2) the instructional services objective was not quite met; and (3) the staff inservice objective was met. Recommendations stress ways to improve student performance at those sites with the poorest performance and development of staff inservices focused on identified problems. Seven appendices cover program design, number of objectives assigned, a copy of the goals and objectives summary sheet, percent of objectives attained, percentile distribution of objective attainment, inservice attendance, and inservice/seminar listing. (DB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 444 320

EC

EVALUATION REPORT

PROGRAM EXPANSION
PRODUCT EVALUATION REPORT

1998/99

DEPARTMENT OF EVALUATION SERVICES

- PROVIDING ASSESSMENT, PROGRAM EVALUATION AND RESEARCH SERVICES -

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF THE CITY OF SAGINAW

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Claus
2A TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Saginaw, Michigan

EC308011

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROGRAM EXPANSION
PRODUCT EVALUATION REPORT

1998/99

An Approved Report of the

Department of Evaluation, Testing, and Research

Paul Kurecka, M.A.,
Research/Evaluation Specialist

Richard N. Claus, Ph.D.
Manager, Program Evaluation

Dr. Foster B. Gibbs, Superintendent
School District of the City of Saginaw

September, 1999

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
EVALUATION PROCEDURES	2
RESULTS	3
Staffing	3
Instructional Services	3
Objective Assignment/Attainment: For This Year	3
Longitudinal Analysis	5
Staff Inservice	6
SUMMARY	7
RECOMMENDATIONS	8
APPENDICES	9
Appendix A: Program Design	10
Appendix B: Number of Objectives Assigned	11
Appendix C: A Copy of The Goals and Objectives Summary Sheet	12
Appendix D: Percent of Objectives Attained	13
Appendix E: Percentile Distribution of Objective Attainment	14
Appendix F: Inservice Attendance	15
Appendix G: Inservice/Seminar Listing	16

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Students Meeting Criterion by Classroom	4
2	Students Meeting Criterion by Year	5
B-1	Number of Objectives Assigned	11
D-1	Percent of Objectives Attained	13
E-1	Percentile Distribution of Objective Attainment	14
F-1	Inservice Attendance	15

Introduction

For the 1998/99 school year, the School District of the City of Saginaw received funding under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA; formerly Public Law 94-142) to continue and expand the special education services if offers through Program Expansion.

The funding grant mandated the following activities for Program Expansion (see Appendix A for the criteria related to each activity/objective).

- To employ 16 special education certified teachers (as specified below) and two psychological services aides:
  - -- Ten certified to work with learning disables (LD) students;
  - -- Two certified to work with emotionally impaired (EI) students;
  - -- Three certified to work with educable mentally impaired (EMI) students; and
  - -- One teacher consultant to work with special education students who are able to attend regular education classes.

  (Teachers with multiple certifications could be assigned to more than one classification of students.)
- To provide instructional services to elementary level LD, EI, and EMI students.
- To provide inservices to its staff members.

Further, Program Expansion had the services of one administrator, two psychological aides, and one secretary.

In the next section, the procedures used to evaluate this program will be described.

Evaluation Procedures

In June, 1999, the program supervisor submitted to the Evaluation Department 1998/99 program records of inservice attendance and student performance data from the 16 Program Expansion teachers.

These data were compared to the criteria specified in the grant. In the next section, the results of these comparisons are presented.

Results

During 1998/99, Program Expansion provided instructional services to 221 elementary level students. These students were classified as either learning disabled (LD), emotionally impaired (EI), or educable mentally impaired (EMI). Two hundred six were served in 15 classroom sites located in 11 different school buildings, with each classroom serving between 7 to 19 students (Mode=14; **Mean [M] = 13.81** with **Standard Deviation [SD] = 3.24**). The teacher consultant (who served the 15 students) and psychological services aides did not work from one assigned classroom.

What follows is a short description of the techniques used to assess the attainment of each program objective and the results of this assessment.

Staffing

A review of employment records verified that 16 special education certified teachers and two psychological services aides were employed to work in the program prior to August 13, 1998 (the first teacher service day). The records also verified that eleven of the teachers were certified to work with LD students, three were certified to work with EMI students, and two were certified to work with EMI students.

The staffing objective was met.

Instructional Services

Instructional programs which met the needs of each student (as specified within each student's IEP) were to be provided. Programs for each student were outlined by selecting individualized objectives based upon these needs.

Objective assignment/attainment: For this year the instructional services objective criterion of the grant was that 75% of the students program-wide would attain at least 70% of their objectives. The criterion applied to students enrolled in the program on or before January 15, 1999, and students enrolled subsequent to that time were not considered in the objective attainment analysis. Examination of the goals and objective summary sheets for each student verified that IEP's and programs were written for all of the 201 (100.0%) students enrolled by that date. Further, they were also written for all of the 20 who enrolled after it.

There was some variation in number of identified objectives; ranging from 2 to 21 per student (**M = 8.88** with **SD = 3.73** - see Table B-1, Appendix B). This results from differences in individualized programs, types of student disabilities, dates of student enrollment, and/or the amount of mainstreaming. (A copy of the goals and objectives summary sheet appears in Appendix C).

The degree of student mastery of these objectives was measured through the use of various teacher-made and commercially available assessment instruments.

Table 1, below, presents the number and percent of the 201 students who met the 70% attainment standard, by classroom site. Appendix D contained a more detailed account of this information.

Table 1

Students Meeting Criterion by Classroom

Classroom	Students[a] n	Meeting Criterion[b] n	%
A	7	3	(42.86)
B	9	8	(88.89)
C	13	13	(100.00)
D	13	13	(100.00)
E	15	13	(86.67)
F	14	12	(85.71)
G	12	10	(83.35)
H	10	9	(90.00)
I	14	14	(100.00)
J	19	11	(57.89)
K	9	2	(22.22)
L	14	10	(71.43)
M	16	9	(56.25)
N	10	3	(30.00)
O	11	8	(72.73)
P	15	8	(53.33)
Total 16	201	146	(72.64)

Note. **N = 201** students.

[a]The number of students does not include those students who entered the program after January 15, 1999.

[b]Criterion: Attainment of at least 70% of their objectives.

From the data in Table 1, it can be determined that, program-wide, 146 (72.64%) of the 201 students attained at least 70% of their individualized objectives. Since the criterion in the grant is that 75.0% would, it can be concluded that the program did not meet this objective. Still, this represents only a slight change from last year when 75.29% of the students attained 70% or more.

Also from Table 1, one can learn that at 8 (50.0%) of the 16 sites, the criterion was attained; at 8 (50.0%) sites, it was not attained. However, this finding should be considered within context. The sites are not the same in terms of either class size or student categories; the needs may be greater in some sites and thus the "program-wide" criterion may not be appropriate to determine progress at any one given site.

Appendix E presents the number and percent of students attaining objectives, by quartiles. A review of that table illustrates that 142 of the 201 students[1] (70.65%) met 75% or more of their objectives, which is approximately the same as last year (119 of 170; 70.00%). As well, 180 (89.55%) of the Program Expansion students met more than half of their individualized objectives.

Longitudinal analysis. Table 2, below, presents the number and percent of Program Expansion students meeting their individual objective criterion during 1996/97, 1997/98, and 1998/99. (Data for the previous years came from the product evaluation reports for those respective years.)

Table 2

Students Meeting Criterion by Year

Year	Students	Meeting Criterion[a]	
	n	n	%
1996/97	168	99	58.93
1997/98	170	128	75.29
1998/99	201	146	72.64

[a]Attainment of at least 70% of their objectives.

[1] This number does not include students who entered the program after January 15, 1999.

As can be seen in Table 2, there was a substantial increase in student performance from 1996/97 to 1997/98 and only a slight decrease from 1997/98 to 1998/99. This suggests that the program supervisor and staff have addressed whatever difficulties or special circumstances that may have led to the earlier lower performance.

Further, considering that the standard was nearly met (72.64% of the students did attain at least 70% of their individually assigned objectives [Table 1] and that 89.56% attained at least 50% of them [Table E.1]), it can be confirmed that the program had a positive impact on the students it served.

Staff Inservice

The criterion for meeting the inservice needs of the staff was that at least five inservices would be held and that ten teachers would participate in at least five inservice sessions. A total of 25 inservice opportunities (some being offered more than once so as to accommodate teacher schedules) were offered.[2] A review of teacher attendance logs demonstrated that all (100.0%) teachers[3] attended at least six sessions. Thus, the criterion was attained. Appendix F contains a summary of teacher inservice attendance and Appendix G contains a list of seminar/inservice topics.

In the next section there will be a summary of the findings for the three program objectives.

[2] They were offered through Program Expansion or the district as a whole. As well, teachers had the opportunity to attend inservices offered outside of the district.

[3] This includes the teacher consultant.

Summary

Throughout 1998/99, Program Expansion provided special education services to 221 elementary level students in 15 classroom sites and through sessions with a teacher consultant. These sites were staffed by 15 teachers with LD, EMI, and/or EI certification. In addition, one administrator, one teacher consultant, two psychological aides and one secretary were on the staff. Instructional programs were written for each student from individually identified objectives. A total of 25 inservice opportunities were offered.

A summary of objective attainment of the 1998/99 project year is contained in the following chart:

Objective	Attainment of criterion
Staff employment	Yes
Instructional services/student attainment	No
Staff inservice	Yes

Two of the three (66.7%) of the program objectives were attained. Further, the slight decline in student performance from the previous year was more suggestive of program stability than a general decline.

The program is run well. The gains in academic performance evidenced by the students demonstrated that **Program Expansion made a substantial contribution to their education**.

In the next section, recommendations are offered.

Recommendations

Based upon this evaluation results presented in this report and discussions with the program supervisor, the following recommendations are offered. When considering them, it should be recalled that all three of the program objectives were attained. The recommendations are intended to help program personnel realize better success for the students.

It should also be noted that the recommendations offered here are not exhaustive. The supervisor and staff may want to consider additional means to attain the desired efforts. Also, they should seek assistance from the Department of Evaluation, Testing, and Research.

Again, readers should note that there was only a slight decline in student performance over the previous year. The program standard of 75% of the students attaining mastery on at least 70% of their individual objectives was not met (72.64%) but it was within a few percentage points of last year (75.29%). Further, over 89% of the students achieved mastery on at least 50% of their objectives. These performance levels suggest that the increase in performance gained between 1996/97 and 1997/98 (see Table 2, above) has been sustained. In conversation with the program supervisor, it was learned that she and the program staff have been working very hard over the past two years on implementing new strategies and activities; the effort has paid off.

The focus should now be on ways to improve student performance levels in light of the improvement already realized.

- There remain some classroom sites where student performance is below the program standard (Table 1). Where appropriate the supervisor and staff should examine sites which are similar in terms of student categories and determine, where success was found, if anything (techniques, practices, materials, etc.) are transferable to these sites.
- Staff inservices might be designed to help deal with the identified problems so that solutions could be implemented and practice in providing the solution could be obtained.

APPENDICES

SE-4625
(Page 7)

PART 10. PROGRAM DESIGN

ISD/Agency: Saginaw Intermediate School District

LEA: School District of the City of Saginaw

Component (Title): Program Expansion

Component Number: 011 **Part 6, Budget Line(s)#:** 122, 197, 214, 218, 219 221, 281, 297, 290 **1997/98 School Year**

OBJECTIVES	ACTIVITIES	EVALUATION AND TIME LINE*
Operate an elementary LD/EI/EMI classroom program for 180 days. A maximum of 150 LD, 30 EI, and 45 EMI students will receive services. Classroom programs will serve no more than 10 students for LD and EI and no more than 15 students for EMI.	Employ: 10 LD teachers 2 EI teachers 3 EMI teachers 1 Teacher consultant 2 Psychological service aides Programs and services will be designed to meet each student's I.E.P.	Personnel records will indicate that staff were hired by 8/13/1998. A review of individual student IEP goals and objectives will evidence that program wide 75% of the students will attain 70% of his/her objectives (applies to students enrolled by 1/25/99). A review of agendas and inservice attendance sheets will evidence that a minimum of 5 inservice sessions will be held and that at least 10 teachers will participate in 5 sessions.

10

APPENDIX A

Table B-1

Number of Objectives Assigned

Student	PROGRAM SITE																Total (n=221)
	A (n=7)	B (n=11)	C (n=19)	D (n=16)	E (n=15)	F (n=14)	G (n=13)	H (n=14)	I (n=14)	J (n=19)	K (n=10)	L (n=16)	M (n=17)	N (n=10)	O (n=11)	P (n=15)	
a	8	9	9	14	3	6	12	3	8	12	6	14	12	13	6	8	
b	7	10	4	14	7	8	7	2	7	10	5	10	18	9	6	5	
c	6	10	9	7	7	8	8	10	6	10	4	5	7	8	8	15	
d	8	10	8	11	10	4	14	9	11	9	2	12	11	8	11	2	
e	10	7	8	10	9	7	15	5	9	11	11	10	10	11	8	6	
f	5	6	9	18	8	8	11	6	9	10	6	4	13	6	11	6	
g	8	6	10	8	6	12	8	5	8	12	15	11	17	10	12	4	
h		9	6	11	7	12	6	3	7	9	31	12	10	11	9	3	
i		8	6	10	9	11	9	6	8	11	5	11	18	10	2	3	
j		9	5	10	5	18	14	9	7	9	8	11	12	11	9	2	
k		6	7	11	6	10	11	10	10	11		10	11		4	3	
l			4	11	5	12	21	5	8	11		16	15			2	
m			6	14	2	6	12	7	9	9		16	11			7	
n			10	5	9	4		9	8	9		11	11			5	
o			6	5	8					11		9	12			4	
p			9	11						9		11	17				
q			9							11			9				
r			10							5							
s			10							9							
M	7.43	8.18	7.63	10.63	6.73	9.00	11.38	6.36	8.21	9.89	9.30	10.81	12.59	9.70	7.82	5.00	8.88
SD	1.50	1.58	2.00	3.29	2.21	3.66	3.89	2.61	1.26	1.55	8.05	3.09	3.18	1.90	2.95	3.22	3.73

Note: **N=221** students. Overall: **M = 8.88** with **SD = 3.73**. Class size: **M = 13.81** with **SD = 3.24**.

APPENDIX C

Student Name: _____ Date of Meeting: _____

[redacted] Goals and Objectives (more than one page may be necessary) [redacted]

INSTRUCTIONAL AREA: _____

Present Level of Educational Performance: _____

Annual Goal: _____

Short-Term Instructional Objectives	Evaluation Procedures	Performance Criteria	Schedules for Evaluation
1)			
2)			
3)			
4)			
5)			

INSTRUCTIONAL AREA: _____

Present Level of Educational Performance: _____

Annual Goal: _____

Short-Term Instructional Objectives	Evaluation Procedures	Performance Criteria	Schedules for Evaluation
1)			
2)			
3)			
4)			
5)			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

White copy - Director Canary copy - CA60 Pink copy - Parent Goldenrod copy - Other PF1160

Table D-1

Percent of Objectives Assigned

	PROGRAM SITE															
Student[a]	A (n=7)	B (n=11)	C (n=19)	D (n=16)	E (n=15)	F (n=14)	G (n=13)	H (n=14)	I (n=14)	J (n=19)	K (n=10)	L (n=16)	M (n=17)	N (n=10)	O (n=11)	P (n=15)
a	87.50	77.78	100.00	100.00	66.67	66.67	41.67	66.67	87.50	58.33	100.00	64.29	75.00	61.54	100.00	75.00
b	100.00	90.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	87.50	100.00	100.00	85.71	80.00	60.00	100.00	16.67	66.67	50.00	60.00
c	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	85.71	100.00	87.50	100.00	100.00	30.00	50.00	80.00	100.00	0.00	75.00	100.00
d	87.50	100.00	100.00	100.00	90.00	100.00	78.57	100.00	81.82	100.00	0.00	100.00	36.36	62.50	0.00	0.00
e	0.00	85.71	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	46.67	100.00	100.00	100.00	36.36	70.00	30.00	18.18	75.00	66.67
f	60.00	66.67	100.00	94.44	100.00	87.50	90.91	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	75.00	61.54	16.67	81.82	100.00
g	50.00	83.33	100.00	100.00	83.33	100.00	87.50	100.00	100.00	58.33	40.00	54.94	52.94	70.00	66.67	75.00
h		88.89	100.00	100.00	71.43	83.33	100.00	100.00	100.00	88.89	58.06	100.00	80.00	54.55	100.00	100.00
i		87.50	100.00	100.00	88.89	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	72.73	60.00	100.00	77.78	100.00	100.00	100.00
j			100.00	100.00	100.00	77.78	100.00	88.89	85.71	88.89		100.00	91.67	81.82	85.71	100.00
k			100.00	100.00	83.33	100.00	90.91		90.00	72.73		70.00	81.82		88.89	100.00
l			100.00	100.00	100.00	25.00	90.48		100.00	81.82		56.25	86.67			0.00
m			100.00	100.00	50.00	100.00			100.00	100.00		68.75	100.00			0.00
n					100.00	100.00			87.50	88.89		100.00	100.00			0.00
o					100.00					63.64			50.00			0.00
p										66.67			52.94			
q										72.73						
r										100.00						
s										88.89						
Number and % Meeting 70% Criteria[b]	3 42.86	8 88.89	13 100.00	13 100.00	13 86.67	12 85.71	10 83.33	9 90.00	14 100.00	11 57.89	2 22.20	10 71.43	9 56.25	3 30.00	8 63.64	8 53.33

Note: N=201 students.

[a]Enrolled on or before January 15, 1999.

[b]Program Wide: (146 of 201) 72.64% of students met the 70% criteria.

APPENDIX E

Table E-1

Percentile Distribution of Objective Attainment

Site	Students by Quartile								Total
	First (0-24.9%)		Second (25-49.9%)		Third (50-74.9%)		Fourth (75-100%)		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
A	2	28.57	0	0.00	2	28.57	3	42.86	7
B	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	11.11	8	88.89	9
C	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	13	100.00	13
D	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	13	100.00	13
E	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	20.00	12	80.00	15
F	0	0.00	1	7.14	1	7.14	12	85.71	14
G	0	0.00	2	16.67	0	0.00	10	83.33	12
H	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	10.00	9	90.00	10
I	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	14	100.00	14
J	0	0.00	1	5.26	7	36.84	11	57.89	19
K	1	11.11	2	22.22	4	44.44	2	22.22	9
L	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	42.86	8	57.14	14
M	1	6.25	2	12.50	4	25.00	9	56.25	16
N	3	30.00	0	0.00	5	50.00	2	20.00	10
O	1	9.09	0	0.00	2	18.18	8	72.73	11
P	5	33.30	0	0.00	2	13.33	8	53.33	15
Total	13	6.47	8	3.98	38	18.91	142	70.65	201

Note. **N=201** students who were in the program at least one semester.

APPENDIX F

Table F-1

Inservice Attendance

Teacher[a]	Number of Inservices Attended
A	6
B	6
C	10
D	6
E	8
F	6
G	6
H	6
I	12
J	6
K	6
L	6
M	22
N	7
O	6
P	6
Overall	**M** 7.81
	SD 4.03

Note. N=16 teachers.

[a]Letter designation for teacher does not necessarily correspond to letter designation for site.

APPENDIX G

A Listing Of Inservice/Seminar Titles/Topics Attended By Program Expansion Teachers During 1998/99

- Cluster Meetings*
- Program Expansion Staff Meetings*
- Houghton-Mifflin™ Reading Series
- Workshop Way
- Scholastic Reading Series
- Brigance™ Training
- Writing Across the Curriculum
- Reading Conference (held in Grand Rapids, MI)
- Classroom Effective Teaching
- Advanced Theory in Learning Disabilities (through Saginaw Valley State University)
- Thinking Maps Training
- Curriculum Planning
- Non Violent Crisis Intervention/Conflict Resolution
- Building School Improvement Plan
- Social Studies: Core Democratic Values
- Graphic Organizers
- Michigan Model (Health Education)
- Water Testing
- IEP Writing
- Individualized Learning Centers and Blue Books
- Classroom and Effective Teaching of Children with Emotional and Behavioral Problems
- Working with ADHD students

---

*In Cluster and Program Expansion staff meetings, the supervisor and staff address both administrative and staff development topics.